IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)
TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO.19419 of 1995

Between:

1 Ramesh & Co., rep. by Hari Pershad, S/o Netram,
Shop No. 15-2-775, Osmangunj, Hyderabad.
2 Gopal Das Agarwal, S/o Motilal,
Shop No. 15-2-771, Osmangunj,
Hyderabad. (Premises under lease to Kerala Trading Co)
3 Jayaprakash Jain, S/o Tarachand
Shop No. 15-2-765 Osmangunj,
Hyderabad. (Lease to Santosh Brothers)

.....
PETITIONERS

AND

1 The Municipal Corpration of Hyderabad. Rep by its
Commissioner, Complex Tank Bund, Hyderabad.
2 The Agricultural Market Committee, Hyderabad, rep. by its
Secretary, Hyderabad.
3 The Government of A.P., Rep by Secretary,
Municipal Administration, Hyderabad.
4 Dayanand, Opp to Ramesh & Co., Opp to 15-2-775,
Osmangunj, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue any appropriate writ, direction or order particularly in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that the Osmangunj Grain Market is a Notified Agricultural Market and the entire Area within the limits of the said Market is a Notified Market Area as per the provisions of the Agricultural Market Committee, Hyderabad/A.P. Agricultural Produce and Livestock Markets Act and no third party including the Respondent No.4 has any right or title to the said Area which is within the Jurisdiction and control of the 2nd respondent herein.

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR.DARSI SUDHAKARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent NO.1: MR.Ghanta Rama Rao

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Mrs. Nanda Ramachandra Rao, SC for Agricultural Market Committee.

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: GP for Municipal Administration and Urban Development.

Counsel for the Respondent No.4: None appeared

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the cause in the Writ Petition does not survive and has become infructuous.

Recording the same, the Writ Petition is dismissed as having become 'infructuous'. No costs.

_____

(N.V. RAMANA, J)

Dated 21.09.2004
Nsr

To
1 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, Complex Tank Bund, Hyderabad.
2 The Secretary, Agricultural Market Committee, Hyderabad.
3 The Secretary, Municipal Administration, Government of A.P., Hyderabad.
4 Two CCs to GP for Municipal Administration and Urban Development, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad (OUT)
5 Two CD copies.